

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. **CV 11-09032 DMG (PLAx)**

Date November 8, 2011

Title ***Gary Bronnenberg, et al. v. Takeda Pharmaceuticals North America Inc., et al.***

Page 1 of 2

Present: The Honorable **DOLLY M. GEE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

VALENCIA VALLERY

Deputy Clerk

NOT REPORTED

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s)
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s)
None Present

**Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS—ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION
SHOULD NOT BE TRANSFERRED TO THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA**

Before the Court is a complaint filed by Plaintiffs Gary and Georgia Bronnenberg. The complaint raises claims for negligence, failure to warn, defective design, breach of warranty, unfair competition, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*, false and misleading advertising, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, and loss of consortium, arising out of Defendants' production and marketing of drugs that allegedly cause bladder cancer. Based on the allegations of the complaint, Plaintiffs reside in Vinita, Oklahoma, and Defendants are based in Deerfield, Illinois, San Diego, California, and Japan.

The parties are hereby **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why this action should not be transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma for the convenience of the parties and witnesses, and in the interest of justice. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 124(a), 1404(a). All factual matters relied upon in the parties' submissions must be supported by appropriate declarations and admissible evidence. To assist the Court in determining whether transfer is appropriate and in the interest of justice, the parties are directed to address the following, in addition to sharing their beliefs as to which forum is more convenient for the parties and witnesses:

- (1) Whether this action could have been brought in the Northern District of Oklahoma;
- (2) Whether venue is appropriate in the Northern District of Oklahoma;
- (3) What contacts, if any, each of the parties has to the Central District of California and to the Northern District of Oklahoma. The parties should include information

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. **CV 11-09032 DMG (PLAx)**

Date November 8, 2011

Title ***Gary Bronnenberg, et al. v. Takeda Pharmaceuticals North America Inc., et al.***

Page 2 of 2

regarding the location of their administrative offices, real property, sources of revenue, and points of public contact;

- (4) What connection Plaintiffs' causes of action have to the Central District of California and to the Northern District of Oklahoma;
- (5) Which witnesses are expected to be called and where they reside;
- (6) The availability of compulsory process to compel attendance of unwilling non-party witnesses in the Central District of California as compared to the Northern District of Oklahoma;
- (7) The ease of access to sources of proof in each of the two forums;
- (8) The expected difference in the cost of litigation in the Central District of California as compared to the Northern District of Oklahoma; and
- (9) Whether there are any alternative forums, other than the Central District of California or the Northern District of Oklahoma, that would be more convenient for this action and why, keeping in mind the inquiries above.

Plaintiffs shall file a response to this Order, in writing not to exceed 15 pages, no later than **November 23, 2011**. Plaintiffs are ordered to personally serve a copy of this Order on any defendant that has already been served with the Complaint within three (3) court days of the date of this Order or at the time of service for any defendant that has not already been served. Failure to timely respond to this Order may result in the dismissal of this action without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.